

MAGGIE E NEUMANN HEALTH SCIENCES RESEARCH FUND

Review

Principal Investigator(s):

OVERALL IMPACT

Reviewers will provide an overall impact score to reflect their assessment of the likelihood for the interdisciplinary project to exert a clear proof-of-concept for novel and potentially scalable approaches to improve the health and well-being of those with chronic disabilities, in consideration of the following five scored review criteria, and additional review criteria. Scoring will be on a 9-point scale where 1= Exceptional and 9= Poor. An application does not need to be strong in all categories to be judged likely to have major scientific impact.

1. Overall Impact Score [1-9]. SCORE:

Write a paragraph summarizing the factors that informed your overall impact score.

SCORED REVIEW CRITERIA

Reviewers will consider each of the review criteria below in the determination of scientific and technical merit and give a separate score for each.

2. Importance of the Research [1-9]. SCORE:

Evaluate the importance of the proposed research in the context of current scientific challenges and opportunities, either for advancing knowledge within the field, or more broadly. Assess whether the application addresses an important gap in knowledge in the field, would solve a critical problem, or create a valuable conceptual or technical advance that would improve the health and/or quality of life for adults or children in Delaware with chronic disabilities. Evaluate the rationale for undertaking the study, the rigor of the scientific background for the work (e.g., prior literature and/or preliminary data) and whether the scientific background justifies the proposed study. Evaluate the extent to which innovation influences the importance of undertaking the proposed research. Evaluate whether the proposed work applies novel concepts, methods or technologies or uses existing concepts, methods, technologies in novel ways, to enhance the lives of Delawareans with chronic disabilities.

Strengths

-

Weaknesses

-

3. Rigor and Feasibility [1-9]. SCORE:

Evaluate the scientific quality of the proposed pilot study. Given the implicit parameters of a pilot study, evaluate the likelihood that compelling, reproducible findings will result (rigor) and assess whether the proposed studies can be done well and within the timeframes proposed (feasibility). Assess the quality of the plans for analysis, interpretation, and reporting and likelihood that this work will serve as a catalyst to the pursuit of larger subsequent funding that will have even greater impact on improving the lives of Delawareans with chronic disabilities. Evaluate the adequacy and feasibility of the plan to recruit and retain an appropriately diverse population of participants – are community and/or commercial partners sufficiently engaged? Are proposed assessments validated and appropriate for the study population?

Strengths

-

Weaknesses

-

4. Expertise and Resources [1-9]. SCORE:

Are the PD/PIs, collaborators, and other researchers interdisciplinary (i.e., hold expertise in distinct fields/areas) and well suited to the project? If Post-Doc is the named PI, is a suitable mentor listed, and mentoring plan briefly described? Do investigators have a demonstrated track-record working with the targeted community and relevant community/commercial partners? If the project is collaborative or multi-PD/PI, do the investigators have complementary and integrated expertise; are their leadership approach, governance, and organizational structure appropriate for the project, and sufficiently inclusive? Does the application have sufficient access to facilities and resources to carry out the proposal?

Strengths

-

Weaknesses

-

5. Target Population-centeredness and stakeholder engagement [1-9]. SCORE:

Does the application include a description of how the outcomes are important to the target population? Is the engagement of relevant target groups and other stakeholders described? Are the strategies to include targeted communities appropriate to the study?

Strengths

-

Weaknesses

-

ADDITIONAL REVIEW CONSIDERATIONS

As applicable for the project proposed, reviewers will address each of the following items but will not give scores for these items and should not consider them in providing an overall impact/priority score.

1. Principal Investigator or Co-Investigator is a current faculty member in the College of Health Sciences.

Comments (if applicable):

-

2. Letters of support are provided.

Comments (if applicable):

-

3. Timeline.

Comments (if applicable):

-

4. Budget is for 12-months, falls between \$25,000 - \$60,000, and meets requirements.

Comments (if applicable):